Case 1:11-cr-00093-JSR Document 107 Filed 10/08/14 Page 1 of 20

E950akss Sentence UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 11 CR 93 V. 5 CETIN AKSU, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. September 5, 2014 9 12:01 p.m. 10 11 Before: 12 HON. JED S. RAKOFF, 13 District Judge 14 15 **APPEARANCES** 16 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the 17 Southern District of New York BENJAMIN NAFTALIS ALEX ROSS MILLER 18 Assistant United States Attorney 19 LAW OFFICES OF LAWRENCE D. GERZOG 20 BY: Lawrence D. Gerzog Attorneys for Defendant 21 Present: Special Agent Paul Larson, DEA 22 23 Turkish Language Interpreter 24 25

1	(In open court; defendant present)
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: This is September 15, 2014.
3	Please bring the defendant to counsel table.
4	This is United States v. Cetin Aksu, docket number 11
5	CR 93, defendant number 3.
6	Will everyone please be seated. And will the parties
7	please identify themselves for the record.
8	MR. NAFTALIS: Good morning, your Honor. Ben Naftalis
9	for the government, joined by Assistant United Attorney Alex
10	Ross Miller who joined the office this week. And Special Agent
11	Paul Larson, with the DEA.
12	THE COURT: You joined the office this week?
13	MR. MILLER: Yes, sir.
14	THE COURT: So what do you need these two guys for?
15	MR. MILLER: Helping me along, your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Welcome aboard.
17	MR. MILLER: Thank you.
18	MR. GERZOG: Judge, I'm Lawrence Gerzog. I represent
19	Cetin Aksu, seated to my right.
20	THE COURT: The gentleman to his right?
21	THE INTERPRETER: Good morning, your Honor, Turkish
22	interpreter.
23	MR. GERZOG: And may I introduce the Court to the Vice

THE COURT: Good morning. I should say good

Consul of Turkey, here in New York.

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

afternoon. And I apologize for the delay. I had other matters which came up.

So, I'm very anxious to hear from counsel, although I have received submissions. Because I think this is a difficult sentence.

To get some of the preliminaries out of the way, I take it both sides are agreeing that the offense level is 43, the criminal history category is 1, and the guideline range, which is not binding on the Court but which the Court must consider, is life imprisonment. Although, not all the counts carry up to life. Count one carries 10 years to life; count two, though, only carries up to 15 years; count three carries 25 years to life; and count four covers only up to five years.

Everyone in agreement with the guideline calculation? MR. GERZOG: Your Honor, I believe you said it is criminal history category I. I believe, by operation of the guidelines because of the second count, it is criminal history category VI, actually. But it doesn't impact the guideline.

THE COURT: Yes, I think that's right.

MR. NAFTALIS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So it's a serious error, then, in the presentence report, which we'll need to get corrected. But I agree it is VI.

All right. But the government has indicated its

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

intention to move for a downward departure and nonguidelines sentence for substantial assistance.

Does the government so move?

MR. NAFTALIS: It does, your Honor.

THE COURT: And that motion is granted.

So here's the real issue.

Oh, I should mention the probation office recommends and a three-year sentence.

The crimes that the defendant committed were obviously very serious crimes. Absent cooperation, this Court would have certainly considered a sentence of many decades, if not life. And I think there was a 25 year mandatory minimum.

On the other hand, his cooperation was certainly very substantial. And under arduous circumstances. So he certainly deserves a sentence that gives him substantial credit for that very substantial cooperation. So it's not going to be 25 years. It will be less than that. It will certainly be much less than life. It is certainly not going to be zero. Defense counsel recognizes that and asks for a three-year sentence.

But where, in between 0 and 25 this sentence should be is, I think, a difficult issue. So let me hear first from defense counsel, then from government counsel, and then from the defendant, if he wishes to be heard.

Mv law clerk corrects me. I said the defendant recommended three years. As I say, defense counsel, but probation recommended eight years.

Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GERZOG: Your Honor, as you said, this is a very unusual case. And I certainly agree with the Court that the crimes that Mr. Aksu stands convicted of are among the most serious that a federal court has to deal with.

However, the reason I ask the Court for a three-year sentence is, in addition to the fact that he cooperated, he cooperated against dangerous people, he cooperated against people who would have a motive to harm him when he gets back to Turkey, is that his involvement in the crime did not come from a desire to aid a terrorist organization. He certainly --

THE COURT: Yeah, he was more of a mercenary, to put it, perhaps --

MR. GERZOG: And even then, Judge, you know his -what happened, as your Honor knows I'm sure from reading all of the papers, Mr. Aksu had a trucking company in Turkey. And it was successful for a while. And but then it went bankrupt. And he attempted to defraud the bankruptcy process in Turkey by selling assets of his trucking company to an underworld figure, this Mr. Norgese. He expected Mr. Norgese to pay him \$300,000. As you see from the papers, he owes that much and more to banks in Turkey. And what he was essentially trying to do, was get out of debt in Turkey.

Mr. Norgese did not pay him the agreed-upon amount.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then Mr. Norgese suggested to Mr. Aksu that he become involved in these matters, and that that might allow Mr. Norgese to pay him the 300,000 he owed him and perhaps some But Mr. Aksu's motivation was not to get rich, not to set his family up for life. He was merely trying to pay back the debts he owed.

Now, of course the way he chose to do that, even in defrauding the bankruptcy process, was inappropriate. And when he got involved in this, he made that mistake much, much more serious, which he understands, and which I understand. But when your Honor uses a word like mercenary, although that is correct, I think of mercenary as someone who, you know, goes to the highest bidder and is out to make a --

THE COURT: Yeah, I agree. It doesn't quite -- it is not the perfect adjective.

MR. GERZOG: And so, you know, although Mr. Aksu has done something very wrong and is very remorseful about it, his motivation was not to become part of the drug trade, not to become part of the weapons trade. He, himself, had no contacts in either area. He, himself, had no opportunity to obtain drugs or weapons from anyone.

You know, as I said in my submission, you know, because he wanted this money from Mr. Norgese, he found himself as a fairly central character in this pot boiler of a conspiracy. And I can only imagine that, at times, he sort of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

looked around and thought, what have I gotten myself into, you know, what's going on here. Given his background, he is just not kind of person who you would expect to be going from city to city and talking about \$9 million worth of arms or \$2,000,000 worth and so forth and so on.

And if you look at the sentence that the Court gave his co-defendant, Mr. Webbe, who I assume -- I have not obviously seen Mr. Webbe's presentence report. But since he was convicted of the terror conspiracy, I assume his guidelines were also quite high. Your Honor gave him a five-year sentence. And Mr. Webbe is a Lebanese national who actually has ties to Hezbollah. And the intent was to get these arms that were fictitious -- since this was a sting. But his intent was to get those weapons to Hezbollah. And Mr. Aksu knew that that was Mr. Webbe's intent. And he didn't go home and say, oh, no, I can't be involved in anything that has to do with Hezbollah. He didn't do that. I understand that. But he was not trying to help Hezbollah. He was simply trying to get the money that Mr. Norgese owed him, so that he could perhaps settle up his life in Turkey and get back on some kind of even keel. And so when you look at Mr. Webbe's five-year sentence, most respectfully, that's why I thought it was appropriate to ask for a three-year sentence. Because Mr. Webbe did intend that Hezbollah be the beneficiary. Mr. Webbe is Lebanese and, therefore, understands fully what Hezbollah is, and who's

Hezbollah, where Hezbollah's politics and tactics lie.

As I mentioned in my letter and as I have learned during the course of this case, the news media in Turkey does not report on Hezbollah the way it reports on Hezbollah here in the United States. Turkey is predominantly a Muslim country. And while I wouldn't say they are supportive of Hezbollah, they certainly don't report on Hezbollah's activities in such a way that an average Turkish citizen would be expected to know that Hezbollah is this very violent world-wide terror organization.

And I'm not saying that Mr. Aksu had no idea. He did know. He was aware of who they were. But he doesn't have, by virtue of his ethnicity, by virtue of his education, by virtue of his background, the kind of familiarity with Hezbollah that obviously Mr. Webbe, who was Lebanese and who was seeking to help Hezbollah.

And your Honor saw fit to give him a five-year sentence. And so that's what caused me to suggest a three-year sentence. And, other than that, all I can say is that as soon as I came onto the case and explained things to Mr. Aksu, he began to cooperate. I didn't have to beat him up, as we say in the trade. You know, he was perfectly willing to do that.

THE COURT: The record should reflect that counsel is using that term metaphorically.

MR. GERZOG: That's right, in air quotes. And he was eager to help. And I think Mr. Naftalis' letter reflects the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

fact that the government benefited from his help. And your Honor heard his testimony at the trial of Mr. Henareh, so your Honor is also aware of how important his cooperation was.

And I know Mr. Aksu does want to speak to the Court.

THE COURT: And I want to hear from him. But I want to hear from the government first. We'll come back to you. Thank you very much.

MR. NAFTALIS: Thank you, your Honor.

You know, of course, I'm not going to recommend a sentence, your Honor. But I do want to, you know, echo what Mr. Gerzog was talking about in terms of just --

THE COURT: Because the government never recommends a sentence, except when it recommends a sentence.

MR. NAFTALIS: Exactly. It's only honored in the breach, but paragraph 9 and 10, it does speak to the other defendant's sentences. Mr. Henareh, who went to trial, and your Honor presided over that trial, was sentenced to 210 months. And I frame that because he was -- he pled. was convicted of the drug offense. Mr. Webbe was convicted of essentially the same offenses as Mr. Aksu, and was given five years. But Mr. Aksu and Mr. Henareh, while they are situated differently factually in the conspiracy and the sting, Mr. Aksu played a very different role, not only in the conspiracy but also to the government. Mr. Webbe did not testify. more aligned with, and directly connected with, the Hezbollah

end of this narcoterrorism conspiracy. He was from Lebanon. He directed to Hezbollah. Mr. Aksu, on the other hand, is Turkish. He was a truck driver and, really, was providing the middleman support. But his role on the government was crucial. And your Honor will remember this from the trial and also the sentencing of Mr. Henareh, the key defense that the government anticipated and then played out was that this was a whole fiction. That the DEA entrapped, not legally, but factually, Mr. Henareh. The drugs were fake. And that was evidence of the fact that this was all make believe. The purity of the drugs, the one sample was very low. So no one really was into this, and but for the DEA's involvement and going overseas, everyone would have lived a happy, law-abiding life.

THE COURT: So I think, though, I need to press you a little bit --

MR. NAFTALIS: Sure.

THE COURT: -- on in terms of culpability -- and then we'll turn to the assistance in a minute. In terms of culpability, who would you, in the balancing all of the relevant areas, do you view as more culpable in this overall conspiracy, Mr. Webbe or Mr. Aksu.

MR. NAFTALIS: I think they are different.

THE COURT: They are different.

MR. NAFTALIS: But I think Mr. Webbe was more culpable, for this reason. There was an ideological -- Mr.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Webbe was not aligned with Hezbollah, but knowingly, and carelessly, and childishly, was a proponent of procuring the arms for Hezbollah.

Mr. Aksu, he was tasked with helping negotiate this deal by Mr. Norgese in Turkey. And I do have to disagree with Mr. Gerzog about, you know, I think while Hezbollah can kind of, especially in these times if you read the paper, can be looked upon as a little bit more of a political group than a terrorist group, I think all reasonable people would put them kind of more to the right of the terrorist scale. But Mr. Aksu was not doing this for, really, for money, or for thrill as Mr. Webbe was. But was trying to get himself out of that kind of bad business deal with Mr. Norgese. He knew what he was doing. Mr. Norgese was kind of the mastermind of the drugs and the transaction with Hezbollah. That's not to excuse it, but he was kind of more of the drug mule, when you think of it, right. He knew what he was doing. He was tasked by the drug trafficker, here Mr. Norgese to kind of act on his behalf. But Mr. Webbe was kind of a different ilk. He was meeting with folks in Lebanon. He was from Lebanon. Very aware of what Hezbollah was. So --

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask you, then, the other question.

MR. NAFTALIS: Yeah.

THE COURT: Which is because I didn't see Mr. Webbe,

1 as you know.

MR. NAFTALIS: Sure.

THE COURT: I didn't see his testimony.

Who gave, if you can, more substantial cooperation, Mr. Webbe or Mr. Aksu.

MR. NAFTALIS: Well, Mr. Aksu testified which, you know, I'll come to that in a second.

Mr. Webbe gave the DEA great help, through his father, as you recall. He gave that third-party cooperation which led to some great seizures. He kind of began the snowball effect which I think helped procure the assistance of Mr. Aksu. But Mr. Webbe never testified. His cooperation was kind of fixed from the moment he pled.

Mr. Aksu, while he initially fought pleading, did plead. And we wanted his cooperation because when Mr. Henareh decided to go to trial, Mr. Webbe was an imperfect cooperator. Mr. Webbe was not charged with the drugs, was not really at any of the meetings that were central to the narcotics conspiracy, both the 1 kilogram delivery with Mr. Henareh or the 189 kilograms that come with the culmination of the case when everyone was arrested. That was not part of Mr. Webbe. Mr. Webbe was in the Maldives when all of that was happening.

So Mr. Aksu -- and this is what I was beginning to say before. The government realized, and I think what the jury took from Mr. Aksu, was he was able to put the color on the

realness of this conspiracy, both in terms of the drugs and, had your Honor let it in, the connection between the drugs and Hezbollah.

Your Honor, we think we called Hezbollah an international drug trafficking organization and left it at that. But had that come in, Mr. Aksu would have spoken to the fact that this was for Hezbollah, the money was for Hezbollah to buy weapons. That he was tasked with doing this by Mr. Norgese, knowing that Hezbollah was involved. We never got into that. But without Mr. Aksu, we wouldn't have been able to connect Mr. Norgese and the drug trafficking to the weapons side of it.

What came out at trial, of course, was just the drug aspect of it. And while a lot of this was recorded, and we had several confidential sources and many agents testify, we only had one witness that was able to say, I was in the room in Turkey when the drug suppliers were making decisions. I was dispatched from Turkey to have these meetings. The drugs were intended to go to the United States. The drugs were supposed to be real. And that was the theme of Mr. Henareh's counsel's defense, was none of this was supposed to happen in New York, it was all supposed to happen in Europe. It was all fake. The drugs were impure. My client was a doctor. He was a sheep herder who was ripped off unwittingly. And Mr. Aksu was able to stand up and say I was actually in meetings in Cypress, in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Malaysia, and Turkey, and we never were talking about medicinal remedies, we were talking about heroin and how to move it to the purchasers and, ultimately, to the United States.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. That is very --

MR. NAFTALIS: That's really --

THE COURT: -- very helpful, yes.

Before we go back to the defense, I'm delighted to have the gentleman from the Turkish consulate here. I didn't know whether he wanted to say anything or not.

MR. GERZOG: I'll let him speak for himself. I think he is here primarily as an observer.

And let me just say, if either the Court or Mr. Naftalis heard me to say that Hezbollah is an educational organization or something like that, they are not --

THE COURT: No, your point is your client may not have been as fully aware of the scope of its activities as someone in a place like Lebanon. I don't think I need to make any determination on where one way or the other about that.

> MR. GERZOG: Very well. Thank you.

TURKISH VICE CONSUL: Thank you, your Honor. I have no words to say.

> THE COURT: Okay, great.

So let me hear from the defendant if he wishes to be heard.

MR. GERZOG: He does.

THE DEFENDANT: I want to apologize with all my heart to the United States, to this Court, to the prosecutors, and especially to my family.

I have done something very wrong. And I'm ashamed of it. I'm ashamed of my actions. And ashamed that I have caused so many people so much hardship.

I became involved with these crimes because my family and I were in desperate financial difficulty. I had no intention or plan to become wealthy, but merely to pay off my business debts.

I realize now, of course, that my family's financial difficulty did not legally or morally entitle me to do what I did.

I realize now that if the conspiracy I thought I was part of had, in fact, been real, I would have caused great harm to many, many innocent people. Frankly, I'm glad the conspiracy turned out to be the way it did, so that this great harm was avoided.

I can promise you, your Honor, that I have learned a very serious lesson from my involvement in this matter, and that I will never, anywhere in the world, become involved in criminal activity again.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Well, I think there is both a macro and a micro aspect

of this sentence.

The macro side, is that in cases of this kind, the United States is totally dependent on people cooperating. And that is not an easy thing for folks to do. The very extreme nature of the crimes and the criminal persons who organize those crimes, such as Hezbollah, makes it a very difficult decision to cooperate. And by this other side of that same coin, means that very substantial credit has to be given for cooperation in order to induce cooperation from people who otherwise would be reluctant to do so.

The American system that is so dependent in cases of this kind, and others, on cooperation, has often been criticized in foreign lands, and otherwise, by people who don't understand that the reason the United States has to offer cooperation is because we don't undertake the more extreme measures, arrests without probable cause, unlimited wiretapping, physical threats by the government, and all of the other things that some other countries sometimes undertake to get the testimony that they need to prosecute these kinds of cases. And so, as a country ruled by law, the best we can offer is cooperation. And it would be a hollow offer if that cooperation was not accompanied by very substantial benefits to the cooperators. So that's the macro side.

The micro side and, of course I have considered all of the factors under Section 3553(a) in determining the sentence.

But one of those factors is the comparison between the two cooperators here, Mr. Webbe and Mr. Aksu. And that's why it was very important to me to hear from the government, a few minutes ago, as to how the government basically evaluates that. Because, while the Court gets to see part of the picture through the trial and through the presentence reports, the government has a more informed view from the entire investigation. And what the prosecutor has just said, is that while Mr. Webbe was very important, particularly at the outset in getting the, if you will, cooperation ball rolling, Mr. Aksu's cooperation was, in the end, more critical. And that while neither Mr. Webbe nor Mr. Aksu can be viewed as having committed other than the most serious crimes, Mr. Webbe's culpability was, in some respects, greater.

So I think that that warrants a sentence below five years, which is what I gave Mr. Webbe.

How long has Mr. Aksu served?

MR. GERZOG: Your Honor, he has been in prison in the United States for two years and 9 months. He was in prison in Romania, which I understand that wouldn't count for four months. So, in total, he has been in prison for a little over three years. But as far as his United States time already served, he has served approximately two years 9 months.

MR. NAFTALIS: He was arrested in Romania in July of 2011. So in counting his preextradition time, since July of

2011.

THE COURT: Well, the reason I ask this is the sentence I was thinking about before hearing from counsel was somewhere between four and five years. And I'm convinced, now, it should be less than five years. But the portion that he served in Romania will not be relevant. It's relevant for him, obviously, and it's relevant in the broader picture. But it's not relevant from the standpoint of the sentence I will now impose. It won't be given as credit. But the portion he has served in the United States will be. So I think, though, taking account of the Romanian portion, I think I will adopt the defense counsel's recommendation.

So the sentence of the Court is that the defendant is sentenced to three years, 36 months in prison, concurrent on each of the four counts. No supervised release will be imposed, because it is obvious he will be deported at the completion of his term.

Also, there is no point in imposing a fine, given his financial circumstances.

There is a mandatory special assessment of \$400 that must be paid.

There is a forfeiture of \$1,750,000. Did the government bring a forfeiture order, or has that already been entered, I can't remember.

MR. NAFTALIS: We already submitted it to your Honor.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

24

25

```
THE COURT: Very good. Thanks very much.
1
               MR. NAFTALIS: Only one other matter, your Honor.
 2
 3
               I believe there is an open indictment and the
 4
      government moves to dismiss it.
 5
               THE COURT: Yes. That motion is granted.
 6
               (Adjourned)
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```